

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verall *et al.* in view of Mortazavi *et al.* and further in view of Woodgate *et al.* Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and submits that the invention recited in Claims 1-24 is patentable over the cited art.

The Examiner argues that Verrall *et al.* disclose a liquid crystal device 10 and identifies element 18 as a front panel, element 15 as a rear panel, element 16 as a liquid crystal layer, and element 17 as an internal polarizer. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Element 18 in FIG. 1 of Verall *et al.* is a liquid crystal cell rather than a front panel as asserted by the Examiner. All the polarizers, including the first and second polarizers 17 and 19, and the reflective polarizer 14, are outside the liquid crystal cell 18. Verrall does not teach any internal polarizer. Verrall *et al.* do not teach or suggest throughout their disclosure any polarizer that is included inside of a substrate of a liquid crystal substrate.

Examiner argues that Woodgate *et al.* teach, referring to FIG. 25, an internal polarizer (66) and an electrode (63) directly laminated each other as recited in instant Claim 24. Applicant disagrees. In FIG. 25 of Woodgate *et al.*, polarizer (66) and electrode (63) are not directly laminated each other. Rather, a color filter (64) and a substrate (103) are inserted between the polarizer (66) and the electrode (63). Further, in FIG. 25, Woodgate *et al.* show a reflective type of LCD, in which the polarizer (66) is disposed only on one side of a liquid crystal layer (62). Woodgate *et al.* do not teach a polarizer on the other side of the liquid crystal layer (62).

Examiner further argues that Mortazavi *et al.* disclose a polarizer made of an optically anisotropic dichroic crystal film comprising a rodlike supramolecules formed from a lyotropic LC containing at least one dichroic dye that is chemically stable at an elevated temperature of at least 150 °C. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's reading of Mortazavi *et al.* is incorrect in two aspects. First, the polarizer film of Mortazavi *et al.* is made of a blend of (a) a wholly aromatic thermotropic liquid crystalline polymer and (b) an organic dichroic dye compatible with the polymer. Thus, Mortazavi *et al.* do not teach an optically anisotropic dichroic film formed from a lyotropic liquid crystal as recited in instant Claim 3. Second, the temperature referred to in Mortazavi *et al.* is one at which the organic dichroic dye is "compatible" with the thermotropic liquid crystalline polymer, *i.e.*, at which the organic dichroic dye and the polymer are suitable to be blended. In contrast, the temperature recited in instant

Claim 1 refers to one at which the material forming the internal polarizer is still chemically stable. The internal polarizer recited in instant Claim 1 is stable at the temperature of its formation.

There is no teaching or suggestion in any of the cited art that would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the cited references. Even if one of ordinary skill attempted to combine the cited references at the time the invention was made, the combination cannot arrive at the invention recited in Claim 1, because Verrall *et al.* do not teach or suggest an internal polarizer, Woodgate *et al.* do not teach an internal polarizer made of a material chemically stable at an elevated temperature of at least 150°C, and Martazavi *et al.* do not compensate the deficiencies of Verall *et al.* and Woodgate *et al.*

Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejections of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Verall *et al.* in view of Mortazavi *et al.* and further in view of Woodgate *et al.* is respectfully requested. Claims 2-24 depend on Claim 1. They are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as for Claim 1.

Based on the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If any matters can be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below. No fees beyond those being submitted concurrently herewith are believed due. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2319 (Order No. A-72209/MSS/TJH (477077-106)).

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP



Tianjun Hou
Reg. No. 51,821

Customer No. 32940
555 California Street, Suite 1000
San Francisco, California 94104-1513
Telephone: (650) 857-1717
Facsimile: (650) 857-1288